

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully requested.

Claims 22-25 are pending.

Claims 22-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Haneda (USP 2003/0133506). Applicants respectfully traverse this art grounds of rejection.

Haneda is directed towards memory management for storing B pictures. In particular, Haneda attempts to reduce the capacity of a B picture memory through his memory management technique. For example, FIG. 3C illustrates the B picture memory 105. FIG. 3A illustrates an index of available memory locations, and FIG. 3B illustrates an index of the B picture being displayed. With respect to FIGs. 4-12, Haneda discloses the method by which data is stored into and read out from B picture memory 105. These figures also disclose how the available memory indexes and display addresses change in the available index control memory 108 and the display index control memory 109, respectively.

Given the teachings of Haneda, Applicants are at a loss as to why the Examiner has cited this document against the claims of the subject application. The present application discloses determining a reference picture for a current field macroblock. Nowhere, whatsoever, does Haneda disclose determining a reference picture for a current field macro block. Instead, Haneda is strictly limited to a method by which B pictures are stored and read

out from memory as well as the management of that memory using available indexes and display indexes. Accordingly, Haneda cannot anticipate or render claim 22 obvious to one skilled in the art.

Claims 23-25, dependent upon claim 22, are patentable at least for the reasons stated above with respect to claim 22.

Claims 22-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Gonzales (USP 6,968,003). Applicants respectfully traverse this art grounds of rejection.

In this art grounds of rejection, the Examiner relies upon FIGs. 13 and 17 of Gonzales as teaching the invention recited in, for example, claim 22. FIG. 13 illustrates the decoder of Gonzales. Motion compensation is performed in the decoder of Gonzales by motion compensator 1309. This operation is described with respect to FIG. 14. As disclosed with respect to FIG. 14 a control variable F indicates whether the macro block being motion compensated is a top or bottom field. If a top field, the control moves to step 1403 where reference data needed to compute the top field of the reference macro block is fetched from the reference frame memory 1312 shown in FIG. 13. If the macro block is a bottom field, then in step S1404 reference data needed to compute the bottom field of the reference macro block is fetched from the reference frame memory 1312. See column 12, lines 32-50.

Accordingly, Gonzales is otherwise silent on how a reference picture is determined, and instead relies upon conventional motion compensation, which does not disclose or suggest "determining a reference picture for a current field

macro block from a reference picture list composed of reference frame,...wherein the determining step determines a field having a same parity as the current macro block or a different parity from a current macro block as reference picture based upon reference picture index information, index information for the reference frame and field parity of the current field macro block," as recited in claim 22.

As stated above, the Examiner relies upon FIG. 17, FIG. 17 is directed towards Gonzales' method of forming an inverse transform, and has nothing to do with motion compensation. This inverse transform method has nothing to do with determining a reference picture whatsoever.

It also appears that the Examiner has mistaken the control variable F as representing the parity of a reference frame, when instead the control variable F merely indicates whether the current macro block is a top or bottom macro block.

In view of the above, it is quite clear that Gonzales is also fairly irrelevant to the claimed subject matter, and does anticipate or render obvious the subject matter of claim 22.

Claims 23-25, dependent upon claim 22 is patentable for the reasons stated above with respect to claim 22 as well as on its own merits.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the art grounds of rejection.

**CONCLUSION**

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the objections and rejections and allowance of each of claims 22-25 in connection with the present application is earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Gary D. Yacura at the telephone number of the undersigned below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKEY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Gary D. Yacura, Reg. No. 35,416

P.O. Box 8910  
Reston, Virginia 20195  
(703) 668-8000

GDY/ame